

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 12-23 remain in the application. Claims 12, 22, and 23 have been amended.

More specifically, the independent claims have been amended by stating that the individual semiconductor grains are disposed or formed to have a clear spacing between adjacent grains. Support for the added terminology is found on page 17, in lines 10-12. There, we explain that the term "grain spacing" means a clear spacing between the lateral surfaces of adjacent grains.

The independent claim 23 has additionally received the feature that the capacitance of the trench capacitor which is being formed in the process is immediately increased by the microroughness, i.e. by the large number of semiconductor grains that are formed directly from the gas phase. Support for the feature is found in the specification in the sentence bridging pages 7 and 8.

Turning now to the art rejection, we respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims over Thakur et al. either alone or over various modifications of the primary

reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The rejection is clearly in error and the Examiner is urged to reconsider the same.

The Examiner is requested to specifically review the specification of the instant application on page 21, last paragraph and page 22, last paragraph. There is no teaching in Thakur et al. whatsoever which has to do with the spacing distance between the grains. It is, furthermore, in no way inherent in the reference that the process or device would result in such free spacings between semiconductor grains.

The invention, as claimed herein, reaches a maximum surface area and results in a maximum capacitance of the trench capacitor by growing only spaced-apart grains -- that is, a single, non-contiguous "layer" of such grains -- causing the microroughness. The reference Thakur et al. neither shows nor suggests such a process and the reference, therefore, cannot be said to render the claimed invention obvious.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 12-23 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, he is respectfully requested to telephone counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is

requested as it is believed to place the application in
better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of
the field of search.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

WERNER H. STEMER
REG. NO. 34,956

WHS:tk

July 31, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 31 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800